



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ANGLO-SAXONICA.

OE. *arsgang* (*latrina*).

Aldhelm's *latrinarum* (ed. Giles, p. 54, 30), is in the Brussels ms. (Mone, *Quellen u. Forsch.* I, p. 411^a = Bouterwek, *ZfdA.* 9, 498^b) as well as in the Digby ms. (Napier *OEGl.* 1, 3917) interpreted by *arganga*, which Bouterwek suggested to stand for *arsganga*. 'Thence,' says Napier in his note to the gloss quoted, 'is the *earsgang* of Ettmüller, Leo, Bosworth-Toller.' But he doubts the propriety of such an inference, in the first place, 'because both MSS. have *ar*-, not *arsganga*'; in the second place, 'because the compound is an unlikely one.' However, *arsgang* will have to stand, for all that. For it is five times on record in Cockayne's *Leechdoms*, and twice we meet with the mistake *ar*- for *ars*- in the first volume, p. 4: *wið þon þe mon þurh his argang blode utyrne* = p. 82, where *O* has the correct *ars*-; in the third volume, p. 138, *þus him egleþ se blod rine. hwilum þurh þa nosa hym gyrp þ blod, hwilum þane on arsganga stitt hyt hym fram yrnaþ*; and, *gif hyt byþ of þan þerman þanne myht þu þurh þane arsgang hyt gecnawan*. Finally, on p. 140, *þanne he to arsganga gæþ, etc.*

OE. *wingearde* (*vitis*).

Aldhelm's *vitis* (ed. Giles, p. 27, 18) is in the Brussels ms. interpreted by *winierdas* (Mone, p. 372^a = Bouterwek, *ZfdA.* 9, 454^a), which in the Digby ms. is spelled *wingerdes*. Napier, in his note to the gloss (*OEGl.* 1, 2017), doubtfully asks: 'Read *wingeardes*? It can hardly be *wingyrde* 'a vine branch,' as *gyrd* is feminine.'¹ But there is more than sufficient proof for a masculine *wingearde* 'vine branch.' In the third volume of the *Leechdoms*, p. 86, we find *nīm wingeardes sæt* (= ? *sæt*) *ȝ gnið on wæte*. *Ibid.*, p. 162, we are told that *gif middeswintres messedeg bið on sunnan deg*, then, among other things, *wingeardas* will be *gode*. *Ibid.*, p. 164, we learn that *wingeardas*, under certain conditions, *beoð geswenefulle*. In the second volume (which I shall quote according to Leonhardi's reprint in vol. VI of *Bibliothek d.*

ags. Prosa, p. 57, 21), we read of *wingeardes twigu ufeward merwe*. Thus, also, the *Regius Psalter* (ed. F. Roeder), Hym. 6, 32, explains *vitis* by *wingearde*, while the *Vespasian Psalter* has *wintreow*, and Luke 22, 18 both the Lindisfarne and the Rushworth gloss render *vitis* by *wingeardes* and this same genitive case for *vitis* occurs in the *Durham Ritual* 3, 10. Hence the compounds *wingearde* (-*bōg*, -*hōc*, -*hring*) do not belong, as Sweet prints them, under *wingearde* m. 'vineyard,' but under *wingearde* m. 'vine.' Nor can *wingeardehring* mean 'bunch of grapes,' as Sweet in his *Dictionary*, p. 207^a, though doubtfully puts it. As is plain from *WW.* 213, 16, *corimbi .i. uiti[s] racemi uel botriones uel circuli wingearde-hringas*, the meaning must be the same as that of *wingearde-hōc* (*capreolus*), *WW.* 201, 31, namely 'vine-tendrill.'

Is OE. *capiān* a nonce-word?

Sweet, in his *Dictionary*, p. 32^b, records it as such with the meaning 'turn, face.' His one instance is, I suppose, from *Leechd.* III, 266, 23, *gyf heo (the sun) hine ontend. neoðan. þonne capað he (the moon) up*. I can add another instance from the Boulogne Prudentius glosses (ed. Holder), *Germania*, XXIII, 393^a, *supinus capiende*, and I refer, by comparison, to *Ahd. Gl.* II, 589, 74, *uteminens also he upcapēnhi*; *ibid.* II, 556, 31, *supinus caffander*; *ibid.* II, 541, 61, *supinata [cervice] capfantemo*; *ibid.* II, 389, 1, *supinus vfcaffenter*.

OE. *edwinde* 'whirlpool.'

Besides *ZfdA.* 9, 421^a, *voraginis . . marg, eadwindan*, we have, *ibid.* 9, 423^a, *in voraginem . . . edwindan . . .* and *ibid.* 9, 529^a, *voragines edwinde*. These three instances from the Brussels ms. reappear in the Digby ms. as printed by Napier, *OEGl.* 1, 636; 707; 5474; and they are increased by one from *WW.* 178, 15 *vortex edwinde*. Compare *Ahd. Gl.* II, 595, 11 *rotet eduwinde*.

OE. *edwælg* (*rediviva* sc. *purpura*).

Though in his *OET.* p. 542^a, Sweet correctly ranges the Corpus gloss 1732 *rediva ættaelg* under *telg* 'dye,' he has failed to give it a place in his *Dictionary*, perhaps, because of my one-time con-

¹ See also J. W. Bright, *The Gospel of St. John in West-Saxon*, Boston, 1904, Note xv, 5.

jecture *edcucig*. This I wish to retract now as unnecessary. I believe *ættælg* stands for *edttælg* 'redyeing' and the *rediva* of the lemma is the *rediviva* of Aldhelm (ed. Giles), p. 19, 30. As to *telg* 'dyeing,' compare *Leechd.* III, 178, on *xviii nihte monan is god ælc telge to anginnanne*.

I, also, wish to retract what I have said in *Anglia* with regard to the necessity of changing *reodnæsc* (*partica*) of *Corpus* 1529 to *reodlæsc*. As to the genuineness of *næsc* '(soft) skin,' there cannot be any doubt. Besides *WW.* 337, 3, *nebris næsc oððe heorþa* = *ibid.* 552, 19, *nebris næst* (read *næsc*), the word is on record in the *Leechdoms* no less than three times, in the part reprinted by Leonhardi for the sixth volume of *Bibliothek d. ags. Prosa*, p. 12. 11 *do on næsc*; p. 32. 18 = 42. 35 *bind on næsce*. While the *læsc* of *readlæsc* (*rubricata*) of the Brussels-Digby Aldhelm glosses corresponds to German *Lösch*, the *næsc* of the *reodnæsc* (*parthica*) of the *Corpus*, etc., may be an n-by-form of German *mösch* 'name eines pelzwerkes' (Grimm, *DWb.* VI, 2595). I am all the more inclined to assume connection between the two because of MLG. *nasch* = *masch* 'receptacle for letters, jewels, etc.' See Schiller-Lübbers, *Mndd. Wtb.* III, 159. I venture the suggestion that this *nasch* (*masch*) was originally nothing but the soft skin of OE. *næsc*, used to wrap valuables up in. As to OE. *læsc* (*læsc*), it has its congener not only in Bavarian *lösch*, but, much nearer home, in MLG. *losch*, and *rēadlæsc* (*rubricata*) has its exact counterpart in *rōthlosch-læsch-lasch* 'rotgegerbtes Ledern, Corduan,' recorded by Schiller-Lübbers III, 513^b. The quotation we find there from *Ndd. Rechtsb.* f. 155, *rothlasch sal nymant mynne vorkopen wen eyne Kunne* 'Of Corduan leather no one shall sell less than five skins,' may lead us to a better understanding of

OE. *cine* (*quaternio*).

Sweet, *Dict.*, p. 54^b, suggests derivation from *cīnan*, and compares *geclofa*, explaining it as 'folded sheet of parchment.' But is it not rather like MLG. *Kunne* and Irish *cín*, a loan from Latin *quīnum*, and meant, consequently, by reason of its origin, as the Irish and MLG. word does mean, 'a layer of five skins (sheets of parchment)?' Not that Ir. *cín* means also 'a quire' and, finally,

'book' in general. According to Sweet, the word occurs only in the glosses. But, besides *WW.* 164, 1 = 314, 10 = 541, 5, there is also an instance of it in Byrhtferth's *Handbōc* 189, *ic warnige þæne þe þas cinan þengð to aspyrianne*. This instance, at the same time, shows that the word cannot be masculine as Sweet would make it, but must be feminine, as Ir. *cín* is feminine, and if my conjecture as to origin be correct, the vowel is probably just as long as it is in Irish. It is even possible that the OE. word is not a direct loan from Latin, put passed into OE. through O. Irish.

OE. *cesol* (*gurgustium*).

I once believed to have reason for impugning the genuineness of *cesol* as translation of *gurgustium*, and suggested corruption from *ceolor*. But I have come to think differently of the matter now. I disagree with Sweet in so far as he separates *cesol* (*ventriculus, stomachus avis*), *Ep.* 1054 from *cesol* (*gurgustium*), *Ep.* 457. I believe the two are one, and *cesol* (*ventriculus*) confirming *cesol* (*gurgustium*), I feel forced to give up my former theory, all the more so because there seems to be a Low German counterpart of the OE. word, if I am not mistaken in my conception of *keusel* I came across the other day, reading J. R. zur Megede's novel, *Modeste*, in *Über Land u. Meer*, 1905, No. 45, p. 1002, col. 1. A certain squire of Prussian Lithuania is introduced there as expressing his regret that he could not get a shot at a fox sneaking around constantly in *den KEUSELN da drüben*. *Der Kreth*, he continues, *steigt in meinem Hühnerstall aus und ein, als wenn das so sein müsste Gegen Abend wird er wol wieder höflich auf meinem Hofe anfragen, ob nicht'n grösseres KEUSELGESCHÄFT zu machen ist*.

Is there warrant for *bedæcc(e)an* (*tradere*)?

According to Sievers, *Ags. Grammatik*³, § 407, note 19, such warrant is given by the *HH.gl.* *bedæhte* (*tradidit*). *Hpt. gl.* stands for *Glosse in Haupt's ZfdA.* (9, 441^a), and it is true enough that there we find the gloss as quoted printed by Bouterwek. But only a few years after Bouterwek's publication Dietrich had (*ZfdA.* 11, 434 ff.) drawn attention to Bouterwek's peculiar way of editing the Brussels glosses "worin leider

was der codex hat und was vermutung ist, nicht allemal zu erschen ist so dass vor dem gebrauch seiner neuen recension ohne vergleichung der ausgabe Mone's gewarnt werden muss und eine neue streng kritische collation der wichtigen glossensammlung zu wünschen ist. This warning as well as Hausknecht's remark (in *Anglia* vi, 103) as to Bouterwek's misprints seems to have entirely escaped the notice of Sievers. Otherwise, I am sure, the distinguished Anglicist would have turned to Mone's print of the glosses and there, on page 361, 95, he would have found the usual interpretation of *tradidit*, *betächte*, which is borne out by Napier's print of the Digby MS. (*OEGL.* 1, 1479). It is, then, on a mere misprint of Bouterwek that Sievers bases his assumption of an alleged OE. *bedæcc(e)an* (*tradere*). It may be well to point out here one or two more errors in the *Ags. Grammatik*. In § 222, note 4, we are told that the form *thuachl* occurs in the *Epinal*. For *Epinal* read *Erfurt* 326. Another, more serious, error is in the statement, § 413, note 1, that *geregnodæ* is a preterit form occurring in the *Epinal*. As *geregnodæ* glosses *composito* of *mendacio composito*, *Epinal* 618 (= *Oros.* 3, 16, 12) it is plain that it must be the instrumentalis of the past participle and, consequently, cannot be the preterit. This mistake has passed over into Büllbring's *Altenglisches Elementarbuch*, § 434, with the additional error that *geregnodæ* is rendered by *regnete* 'rained.'

Is there an OE. *besütian*, from which *besütod* 'dirty'?

Sweet has inferred this entry from the Boulogne Prudentius gloss (*Germania* xxiii, 403^b) ^{*i. sordidum*} *obsoletum* *besutod*. I would suggest that *besutod* is either mistake for *besötud*, and that we have to do then with *besötian*, a derivative of *söt* 'soot,' or that *besutod* is misread for *besüttod* = *besmittod*, which glosses *caccabatus* (*Zfd.A.* 9, 504*).

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Wolfenbüttel, Germany.

ST. HUBERTUS IN GOETHE'S

ST. ROCHUSFEST ZU BINGEN.

In Goethe's charming, grandfatherly account of the festival in honor of St. Rochus held on the saint's day, August 16, 1814, occurs the following passage. The poet and his friends were sitting at table at Rüdesheim, in the evening, talking of the saint :

"Indessen hatte sich ein Fremder eingefunden und zu Tische gesetzt, den man auch als einen Wallfahrer betrachtete und desshalb sich um so unbefangener zum Lobe des Heiligen erging. Allein zu grosser Bewunderung der wohlgesinnten Gesellschaft fand sich dass er, obgleich Katholik, gewissermassen ein Widersacher des Heiligen sey. Am sechzehnten August, als am Festtage, während so viele den heiligen Rochus feyerten, brannte ihm das Haus ab. Ein anderes Jahr am selbigen Tage, wurde sein Sohn blessirt ; den dritten Fall wollte er nicht bekennen.

Ein kluger Gast versetzte darauf : bei einzelnen Fällen komme es hauptsächlich darauf an, dass man sich an den eigentlichen Heiligen wende, in dessen Fach die Angelegenheit gehöre. Der Feuersbrunst zu wehren, sey St. Florian beauftragt ; den Wunden verschaffe St. Sebastian Heilung ; was den dritten Punct betreffe so wisse man nicht ob St. Hubertus vielleicht Hülfe geschafft hätte ?¹

The words now italicized seem to have presented a very serious difficulty to Goethe's editors, the latest, of whom, Karl Heinemann, gives merely the following helpless footnote (17,263) :—"Bischof von Lüttich (700-728), Patron der Jäger." Strehlke, in the Hempel edition, remarks (26, 344) :—"Apostel der Ardennen und Bischof von Lüttich im achten Jahrhundert, dessen Gedächtniss am 3. November begangen wird. Die Beziehung ist hier etwas dunkel. 'Unser Heiliger,' sagt die 'Heiligen-Legende' von ihm (S. 1011), 'besass immer die besondere Gewalt, Wahnsinnige, Tobsüchtige und Mondsüchtige zu heilen.' Hat Goethe diese Beziehung im Auge gehabt, so

¹My explanation came too late for use in Cotta's *Jubiläumsausgabe* (Vol. 29), now in progress, but the general editor, von der Hellen, informs me that he considers it "sehr einleuchtend."